

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
September 21, 2006**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dennis Cope, Lee Madrid (arrived at 7:15 p.m.), David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols and Mery Velastegui

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Gary Lee, and Dianna Broadie, Senior Planners; Nathalie Schmidt, Assistant Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:05 PM. Design Review Board members Robert Hall and David Wobker were excused.

APPROVAL

L060369, 1st Security Bank

Description: Tenant improvement with exterior modification
Location: Overlake Village Shopping Center at 14808 NE 24th Street
Applicant: Molly Foster with Driftmire Architects
Staff Contact: Steve Fischer / 425.556.2432
Nathalie Schmidt / 425.556.2471

Nathalie Schmidt, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report on this proposal for exterior modifications, including opening up some new windows and closing up some doors, moving the main entrance to the west elevation, and adding a new metal canopy above the entrance. For the proposed lighting, the applicant had provided some specs. Staff recommended approval of the building elevation, colors, materials and lighting with conditions.

David Seely and Molly Foster, Driftmire Architects, 7983 Leary Way, Redmond, WA 98052, were present for the applicant. As part of the proposal, they would like to relocate the previous entrance to the west end. This will help the business better address 148th Avenue NE. The entrance element is part of the prototype design for the bank. The lighting has been raised as an issue. They had the lighting cut sheets for the four post light fixtures #205 that will go on the front of the two columns and on the outside of the two columns. The light fixture they have selected is a half-sphere wall light that emits light from all directions. In order to address the cutoff so the light does not affect the night sky, they plan to incorporate a soffit across the bottom of the truss to prevent the light coming out of the top from being directed toward the sky. There is another light fixture #309 that could be used that has a shielded top portion of the sphere. They requested that the original light be used and to use projections of the soffit as it overhangs out and over on the sides to act as a shield from the night sky effect. The mall has requested that they not disrupt the main roof structure so they do not want that to be open. The canopy will be sitting on the existing roof. They cannot match the existing tile on the roof. The glass above the door is opaque white spandrel glass and is essentially a siding glass to add color and light.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

MS. VELASTEGUI:

- Suggested doing something more interesting than only the glass in the triangle above the door.
- Thought they are very limited by the mall but doing a good job for the bank.
- Thought orienting the door to the west on the end a good idea.
- Considered this an opportunity to create some special feature or landmark.

- Agreed with the lighting.

MR. COPE:

- Liked the new front door orientation toward 148th Avenue NE.
- Was fine with the lights.
- Thought it unfortunate that the roof material does not match the roof. It is an appliqué reinforced by the fact they cannot cut into the roof. The materials look like fake eyelashes.

MR. MADRID:

- Agreed with the previous comments.
- Confirmed that the ATM area would be lighted to a certain level for security reasons with lights recessed under the soffit.
- Wanted to look at the metal roof color. Was not a huge fan of the roof, but understood that they could not cut into the existing roof.
- Would have preferred to see a sample of the spandrel glass.
- Confirmed that the infill bricks would match and blend in well.
- Noted that the plan shows the canopy element, but the elevation does not.

MR. MEADE:

- Would have liked to see a sample of the spandrel glass.
- Was not a big fan of the tile concept—to him replacing brick with tile is like replacing wood with plastic. The tile module does not quite match the dimension of the area below windows. Inquired if there were another option, such as 6- or 18-inch tiles.
- Confirmed that the store front doors are like the windows already existing in the project and are clear glass. Said he was not thrilled by the white glass and thought Ms. Velastegui's comment that it should be another material made sense. Confirmed that the coping would match the metal roofing, a black or dark bronze.
- Suggested that the planter areas shown in picture 4 on page 10 be enhanced with this project.

MS. PROMER-NICHOLS:

- Requested a description of where the brick and tile will be located. (Ms. Foster responded that the brick is the main body of the building. They will remove the brick underneath the existing windows that will remain and put a tile wall in place of that. Any windows that they replace will match the existing material. The doors will be filled in with the exact brick.
- Thought that some nice pots with greenery at the front door would relieve the severity.
- Agreed with the roof comment and understood their dilemma. Suggested that they examine the roof material one more time so it does not look like a paste-on, but would not make this a condition for approval.
- Recommended that improving the planting areas be worked out with staff.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE L060369, 1ST SECURITY BANK IMPROVEMENTS AND COLOR BOARD AS PRESENTED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- The applicant should use Light #309 and a soffit on the lights to screen the light from upward.
- The spandrel glass in the plans shall be submitted to staff and to the Design Review Board for a quick follow up.
- The applicant should work with staff to improve the landscape bedding at the west elevation as presented in the plans.
- **Presentation Materials Inconsistencies**
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11" x 17"

submitted drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for the Site Plan Entitlement.

Motion carried (5-0).

MINUTES

August 17, 2006:

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AUGUST 17, 2006, MEETING MINUTES, AS CORRECTED, TAKEN IN THE CONTEXT THAT BOTH BOARD MEMBERS DID NOT HAVE COMPLETE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROPOSAL AND THEIR COMMENTS WERE LESS RELEVANT WITHOUT THAT KNOWLEDGE. MR. MADRID'S COMMENTS DO NOT APPLY AT ALL IN TERMS OF THE PARKING DECK OR THE SITE PLAN IN GENERAL. ALL OF MR. COPE'S COMMENTS REGARDING THE REDMOND TRANSIT PARKING GARAGE WERE WITHDRAWN. MOTION CARRIED (2-0-3), WITH MR. MEADE, MS. PROMER-NICHOLS AND MS. VELASTEGUI ABSTAINING.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. MADRID TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 7:40 P.M. MOTION CARRIED (5-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060012, Cleveland Street East

Description: Redevelopment of property with a six-story mixed-use building consisting of approximately 120 residential units, ground floor retail and related parking.
Approximately 136,000 gross square feet

Location: 16025 Cleveland Street

Applicant: Lis Saldano with Cleveland West LLC

Prior Reviews: 03/02/06, 05/18/06 and 07/20/06

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report and analysis for this project on the current Valley Supply site. He summarized the administrative design flexibility requests. Staff and the Board were in agreement with allowing the parking stalls to be counted toward the parking requirement for retail uses, for allowing the balconies to project closer than 5 feet to the property line along 160th Avenue NE, and allowing supporting columns holding up the bay window projections above to encroach 7 feet in the 14-foot-wide sidewalk area on 161st Avenue NE and allowing a 7-foot-projection above, where only 5 feet is allowed. Staff was unclear about the Board's determination on allowing balconies that are 36 feet in area and 4 feet wide, where 50 square feet and 5 feet is the minimum width. Staff was also unclear about the Board's determination on allowing the modulation standards to be waived, with the use of architectural emphasis on prominent building corners.

Dianna Broadie, Senior Planner and historic authority, confirmed with the applicant that the brick in the middle section would be a different color. Although she realized that the applicant was responding to the Design Review Board in the deck-ganging issue, she thought that the first design came closer to a historic pattern. She explained that in the first proposal there was a vertical element and then a mirrored vertical element, resulting in a very symmetrical, repetitive pattern, which is a very positive thing. They did respond well to the window forms in general, but with a little more modification of the window forms the repetitive pattern might result. Separating the decks as the DRB requested has broken up the symmetry, but possible responses that would continue to allow the decks to be separated would be modulation to create verticality, repetition, and symmetry, and strengthening the two end pieces. She agreed with Mr. Lee's comment about the cornices needing to be strengthened. Possibly a unified cornice would be better for the building than the alternating colors. She thought the banding needed to be strengthened to separate the different elements.

Peter Greaves, Weber Thompson, 425 Pontius Ave N, Seattle, WA 98109, explained that there are windows on either side of the recess—the residential entry notch—has storefront retail on both sides of the entry and

the entry itself is glass. The July 20 drawing was hand drawn of the cornice, which was approximately three feet tall. The cornice on the Cleveland is also three feet tall, so the cornice is in proportion to the building and does not need to be any taller. The change in color in the upper neutral portion of the recessed building is provided by fabric awnings over each of the five-foot recessed balconies. There is additional sun protection on the top floor, done to break up the line at the sky. The cornice beltline between the portions of the building is in proportion to what it needs to be and is consistent with the earlier documents. The piece that caps the retail base is about 42 inches. The piece at the top is 36 inches. This serves to look like a white belt around the building, giving the change in material and texture a very slight underscore. The rooftop mechanicals will be grouped behind the upper portions of the building and not have to be screened. The top to the wood trellis at the courtyard will have a clear corrugated product. The trellis slopes so it will be self-cleaning to a certain extent, but will require hosing off. Regarding the commentary on repetitious window patterning, there is a greater variety of window sizes and types in this version than in the version shown on July 20. They think the repetitious pattern is perfectly suitable in the historic district. In response to the commentary on the first building with the reduced deck depth, there are three instances where the balconies are less than five feet. In each of those cases, there is a full-width glass with bi-parting glass doors. There is another instance on the return corner that faces 160th, which is a secondary balcony in a single unit, which is something Ms. Broadie told them was more appropriate to the historic district, so they have a pair of sidelights and then a single door. Then the last instance of balconies that are not five feet is in the notch facing 161st, and those are metal balconies that are only four-foot balconies because a full five-foot cantilevered balcony does not work there. He went through the revisions they made to the building, using a handout. In the original building, they had tried to create a taller, vertical recess in the building, and by doing that had ganged decks. Their original intention was to create a module that was bigger than a single 10-foot deck. In doing so, some of the DRB felt this was inappropriate and not the right solution. So they redesigned the units and rearranged the building to have decks separated to the outward edges. There was a great deal of discussion about symmetry versus asymmetry. Considering that they are trying to build a contemporary building in a historic district, they are offering an alternative that says these appear to be more traditional pieces and the center of the building appears to be a little more contemporary. The building is very responsive to the site plan and very contextual. There are moments of localized symmetry and also moments of asymmetry. Regarding the variety of windows sizes and types, they have responded by introducing five different windows types. In the typical bedroom configuration, where before there was a fixed light and a vertical single hung next to it, they broke that into two single-hung windows and separated those to create a vertical, fairly traditional pattern. In the living room area, they ended up making the center element more vertical so that it is in the proportions that suit the guidelines. They took the ganged elements and spread them out in various patterns. They are still trying to emphasize the verticality of the corner pieces. Regarding the colors on the neutral portion of the building that were previously thought too cold, they returned with more similar colors, but not identical to the other building, Cleveland Street West. There is a pale green banding and a vellum color that marks the windows. There was criticism that the retail façade on Cleveland Street was too regular, specifically regarding the base of the building. The last version had the brick columns, awnings, and broke up the repetitious storefront windows. Over time there would be different iterations of retail occupancy, so that it would mature and change to the point that it looked like a more traditional street façade. At this point, they create a neutral container for the retail. In response to the comments, they have changed the center one-story section of the building to a lighter brick color. They had three different awning colors for the DRB to consider. There was comment that the residential entry at Cleveland Street was not good, so they lopped off that corner of the retail and allowed this portion of the building to exist and mark the corner of the entry. This allows the building to come down and hit the sidewalk more. They eliminated the yellow accent color and decided to use a warm coral color. Regarding the central courtyard, the applicant's response was to change the material for the private portions of the courtyard so there is clear differentiation of the public and private. Due to conversations with the Transportation Division, they had to lop the corner off this site and lost some buildable land. The shape and size of those two residential courtyards were fairly small—the private one on Cleveland Street was a 120-foot-long and only 20 feet deep in the middle triangle. They retained the building shape as before. They did some computer modeling. Regarding the courtyard that would never get any sun, they disproved that because the courtyard will get some sun as early as March and as late as October although it will never be in full sun. There are three buildings in a row here—Cleveland Street, Cleveland Street East and Cleveland Street West. Hollowing out the center of this building is a better urban design response that puts the public space on the public side of the building, gives an opportunity for more sun on Cleveland Street, and puts the

trail-facing units right on the trail on the south side. So a courtyard on the north side of the building works. He compared this to the Olympic Four Seasons Hotel in Seattle that has a wonderful north-facing courtyard. He described the revised elevations, with the building broken into discreet masses and using the breakup of the building to break down the massing in a more natural, more responsive way. They are considering the corners of the building to be the more historic pieces, considering the center of the building to be a more neutral fabric. A better way to look at the building is to look at the black and white renderings. They had redone the color board. The base brick is a dark chocolate color. There is a precast banding element that marks the end of the PP slab and the start of the wood construction for the residential. They changed the brick in the center to a lighter color to provide a little more variety. The storefront is still the same color. The awnings that are in the storefront would probably be the silver anodized color with the fabric so they work with the storefront. The awnings at the top could be either an anodized frame or a black frame.

Mark Brumbaugh, Weisman & Associates, 600 N. 85th Street #102, Seattle, WA 98103, explained that they are proposing to use a different material for the private patios—either a natural material wood or maybe a TREX-type product—and using that material to define the passage out to the more public areas. They are proposing an oversized fireplace to create a cozy space out there and flanking that covered area with open trellis work where they would plant some deciduous vines so there would be cover in the summer and be more open in the winter for more light. They created a separate area for a barbeque with tables for small groups. Plant materials would be mostly shade-tolerant grasses, such as bamboo, ferns in a geometric pattern. They are carrying that theme down into the entry.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Appreciated the presentation and the applicant taking the DRB's comments into consideration.
- Showed some photos from the Fremont area in Seattle that would better explain the concepts of one building looking like three buildings simply because of the colors. Varieties of balconies and the metal treatment gave a sense of place and identity
- Thought they had a nice building, but not strongly identified corner elements.
- Liked the window size variety.
- Suggested they use different colors for breakup of the building
- Suggested they create a new band between the fifth and sixth or between the fourth and fifth floor to create a different rhythm because the building has the same rhythm across the facades.
- Suggested some variety in the deck railings.
- Thought they did a nice job creating some variety on the street level with the rhythm and colors of the canopies.

Mr. Cope:

- Echoed that this was an excellent presentation; very easy to understand the project because of excellent documentation.
- Wanted clarification on page 1 about the departures that indicates with an asterisk that the DRB on May 18, 2006 accepted the departure for the balcony. He did not remember that happening.
- Confirmed that the penthouse materials would be Hardi-panel in the lighter vellum color.
- Confirmed that the top cornice material would be built-up wood.
- Requested that at the next review at least one of the elevations could be rendered to interpret the joining of the various widths of Hardi-panel.
- Confirmed that the inset flat painted panel would be Hardi-panel.
- Considered the northwest corner to be a handsome elevation and well within the intent of historic.
- Noted that the elevation on page 19 indicates that the planter with all the landscape screening is not shown on the landscape plan; clarified that the planter is right up to the building.
- Liked the courtyard on the north tremendously and that it is on Cleveland. Liked the improvements, the decking designations, and would not change a thing on that courtyard.

- Noted that Exception F on page 29 is actually the second balcony in that unit and really does not count, so they are down to 18 units that do not quite have the five-foot balcony, which is less than 16% of the units. He was fine with where they ended up.
- Commented that he attended a good AIA conference recently that had a lot to do with sustainability and livable communities. He insisted that the DRB and the City have to start requesting that the elevations are responsive to their orientation. Wished that this project had taken the design one level farther and addressed the issue of sustainability.
- Thought they have been very responsive to previous DRB comments.
- Did not mind the size of the building. Thought the analogy to the Olympic Hotel to be a very good one because the dimensions are similar. He thought Ms. Velastegui's comments would apply more to the next project on the agenda. Felt comfortable with the approach the applicant has taken with the big building.
- Agreed with the applicant's responses to staff comments 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. On #4, he was fine with the band between the fifth and sixth floors being nine inches. For #7, he thought there was enough symmetry going on that he was fine with the windows.

Mr. Madrid:

- Thought the building in general to be very handsome.
- Was appreciative that the applicant had been very responsive.
- Was concerned about the lack of a cornice element on the inset. Was not quite comfortable with that and wanted to see a cornice element there.
- Loved the courtyard.
- Confirmed that all existing trees would be removed because of the realignment of 160th, the building foundation construction and the general work necessary, and also because the trees have a lot of aphids. Requested that when trees are going to be replaced or ripped out he would like to be notified by staff. (The applicant explained that they are providing more trees than existing.)
- Was fine with the balconies and thought the applicant had done what was possible.

Mr. Meade:

- Confirmed that the nine-inch band between the fifth and sixth floor would have some shadow.
- Reiterated that the elevation is suffering because of the lack of delineation of materials. The observer struggles to fill in the blanks and create closure because of inability to see a lap or pattern in the paneling material. Would like to see what the more detailed elevations look like when the project returns for approval.
- Commented that if the intent is to make the center piece recessive then the lighter accent color makes it a little less recessive than the darker tones used at the corners.
- Wanted to see how the stair and elevator towers are handled and reflected in the plan based on staff's comments.
- Was in support of some kind of logical variety in the selection of the balcony railings. Could be asymmetrical is desired, but there should also be a second choice, something to add some distinction to some locations.
- Thought the terrace was extraordinarily successful.
- Commented that tearing out and replacing the street trees is a great idea based on their age and the condition of the site.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Cautioned that the DRB members are becoming very sensitive about any trees that go away and need to know more detail about those going away.
- Liked and appreciated the courtyard.
- Confirmed there was a barbeque in the barbeque area.
- Considered the residential entry to be much better.
- Supported the change in railings to make some differentiation.
- Thought the analogy with the Olympic Hotel was brilliant and caused her to look at the building in a completely different way. The piece that recedes back changes the whole dynamics of the building so that it is not one flat street façade.

- Was a little nervous about the flat surfaces. Would like the detailing of how these would actually work.

There was agreement with the deviation from a minimum amount of articulation based upon the length of the façade based upon articulation of other areas and articulation of the building in general. There was also agreement with the current balconies and that the project did not need another pre-application.

Lis Soldano, representing the applicant, requested a specific list of requirements for the SPE application.

Staff replied that the DRB is looking for detail in the expression of the flat surfaces on a reasonable part of one elevation. The applicant should bring back a larger-scaled rendered elevation with material differentiation, options on the balcony railings, and a landscape plan.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060042 & PRE060048, REDMOND TOD

Description: Six-story mixed use building to include approximately 300,000 square feet, occupancy 324 units, 15,000 square feet of retail space and 150,000-square-foot parking structure.

Location: 161st Ave NE & NE 83rd Street

Applicant: Tom Eanes with Hewitt Architects

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report for this first pre-application review for the Metro residential project in downtown, saying that staff is excited about having this development—the mixed-use, TOD concept—but somewhat concerned about the design. Mr. Lee explained that the applicant is requesting an additional floor to six stories and proposing to use the bonus system, which is provision of additional public space on the south side for the granting of that additional floor. They are also requesting administrative design flexibility regarding the patio; they are proposing that 40% of the units not have any balconies and an additional percentage have balconies of smaller sizes, which they can have provided the design of the building warrants it and they pay an in lieu fee for those balconies that are not provided. The DRB would consider whether or not it is appropriate to have smaller balconies and areas where the balconies are omitted. Staff is concerned about the elevations of the project since it is a large development in a prominent location.

Mr. Cope requested to review both the Transit Oriented Development and the Transit Center Parking Garage at the same time. Judd Black, Development Review Manager, agreed that this could be done contextually but not for approvals. Mr. Cope settled on being able to see the boards for both projects concurrently.

Mr. Lee confirmed that the applicant is requesting a break of 1.16 ratio vs. 1.25 ratio for the parking stalls, and staff was still considering that request. The downtown parking ratio for residential development is lower than other areas. Mr. Lee also confirmed that Metro would own the land for the parking garage portion and would sell the residential portion to the developer.

Paul Fusel with KPG gave a brief history of the project.

Gary Prince, project manager for the TOD, gave some background on the project. He explained that the City helped select the developer Trammel Crow for the TOD. King County Metro will be renting parking spaces from the City while the projects are being built. Trammel Crow will be responsible for owning, developing and maintaining the pedestrian corridor that is a requirement for the project.

David Hewitt, architect for the TOD, explained that the north façade relates to the transit center. There would be a 30-foot pedestrian corridor on the east side of the project. The existing structures around the project are mostly one-story, strip commercial in character with some street trees, but there are some multi-family buildings nearby. There is a water-table issue on the site. Although they are requesting an additional story for the building, they would be actually ten feet under the height limit. (The code requires a 75-foot, five-story building—the proposal is for a 65-foot, six-story building.) The building would have a

series of courtyards that would spill out onto the street. There would be a loading dock that is lower and out of view. There would be one entrance to the garage that is hidden from view. This could be a strong retail edge that is related to the transit operations. Metro's garage steps back at 15 to 20 feet. The TOD has the podium of the garage, but sets back sometimes as far as 30 feet from that edge. There would be a significant landscaped stairway leading up to the podium. The retail windows on the ground floor have a rhythm that reflects some of the massing elements above, so the building tends to be more connected to the street. There would be metal canopies with steel supports, masonry at the base, and sunscreen on the upper two stories. The garage entrance was moved off the street and is located in the pedestrian access. They have tried to make the building softer on the edges and have a crisp outline termination at the top. To address the scale of the building, they are using a consistent color palette, a masonry base with a bit of a concrete upstand with a detail for termination, a canopy with a bronzy green edge, and horizontal beveled line two inches out, two inches in Hardi-plank that gives a texture of corduroy.

Mark Brumbaugh, landscape architect, 600 N 85th Street #402, Seattle, WA 98103, commented that he thought reversing the building to be a big improvement. There are some fairly large conifers that will remain on the site. Along the corridor between the garage and the building, the walk will meander and have plantings on both sides. The intent is to put greenscreen trellis on the garage openings. They will berm up the earth against the fence so there will not be a total flat plain. This will be a fairly shady space, so gives an opportunity to plant ferns, jostas and trees like vine maples. The same is true for the north courtyard. The courtyard is still at the concept level for the pre-app. At the next review they will show much more detail. They are looking at the spaces and deciding what is the appropriate amount of hardscape versus landscape. They are looking at new street trees because roadwork and construction preclude saving the existing trees.

Judd Black, Development Review Manager, commented that staff had met with the applicant the previous week and thanked the architecture and design team for listening to what staff said. Staff's comments that the building was monotonous, did not feel very friendly, was introverted, had incorrect massing and did not seem to be addressing downtown very well. Turning the building around made the building much more extroverted and relate to the downtown so much better. Staff would still like to see more outdoor space along the frontages there. There will be a lot of activity there. People will enjoy being outside looking at that. More balconies rather than less would be better. The sketch took the ends of the building and put them out front. This should result in an extroverted expression.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS

Mr. Meade:

- Would like to see some modulation of height in the center, something that gives it a chance to have some prominence and become a focal point from across the street.
- Liked the end pieces and how they are turned, but thought the narrow units on the side are too narrow and too vertical so should be bridged with color or material to unite them.
- Thought the pedestrian path should rise and fall in altitude as the other paths do to help change the scale of the garage on either side and create an interesting passageway there.

Mr. Madrid:

- Echoed about the vertical elements. The Hardi-plank siding is nice, but is too symmetrical. Something needs to come out from there. Likes the way the vertical elements are articulated and is much improved from before, but need to be done better.
- Loved the terrace concept above the retail.
- Was curious to see the path between the residential and parking garage and wanted to see something special there to diminish the effects of the large parking garage.
- Thought they were headed in the right direction. Much improved. Excited to see the next concept.

Mr. Cope:

- Supported granting the break in the parking ratio..
- Commented that this is a very important project for the city.
- Said he likes density—has no problem with density in the hands of a good designer.

- Liked the amount of commercial and it being on two sides. This would be a people place not only because of density of this project but also because of what else is going on around it.
- Thought the massing was excellent.
- Would like in the next presentation to know what is being done about stormwater and architectural design that has to do with sustainability and green.
- Thought this project ought to emphasize reducing the amount of automobiles; with this density, flex cars would work here.
- Recommended doing something for the kids.
- Said he was very sensitive to how the mid-block pedestrian 30-foot thing will evolve. Landscape and architecture would have a lot to do with the success of that. He looks forward to seeing the building elevation that snugs up to and looks down on the garage.
- Thought the path an opportunity that could have something really dynamic done to it because of the way it is so contained.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Liked the project and could see some kind of landmark or sense of identity for this place.
- Liked the way they are playing with the rhythm of the facades. The recessed corner is excellent. This brings the scale of the building down and makes it more human.
- Thought this a good opportunity to create something that attracts young people from across the street and attracts the communication between the two sides of the street; something that creates interaction.
- Thought that texture of the facades was very important.
- Would like to see colors next time.
- Considers the street level so important. Some places are not inviting when there is too much glass. Suggested playing a little more with the rhythm on the first level to invite people to the retail.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Liked the direction the project is moving.
- Seemed to her in this iteration that the expression of the vertical elements above did not get expressed in the columns below. Hoped that would show up again.
- Suggested that the retail façade should be pushed in or pulled out—something to have a different expression on the retail level.
- Inquired if there were a provision for public art.
- Suggested that playing with grade change and walls could add variety.
- Was very excited about the direction of the project.

Mr. Madrid emphasized the need for a site plan perspective on projects like this so the DRB members can put buildings in relation to each other, and requested staff to provide as much information as possible in the future.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060039, Redmond Transit Parking Garage

Description: Three-level parking garage consisting of 108,000 square feet, one ground level, two elevated levels containing approximately 380 parking stalls. Designed to the draft Downtown District Design Standard and 2003 IBC

Location: NE 85th Street & 161st Ave NE

Applicant: Gerrie Jackson with King County Metro

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Steve Fischer, Senior Planner, presented the staff report, describing the north façade and requesting that the DRB members consider the green screen, the need for a third-floor plan showing lighting, and the use of vertical members to break up large voids on the garage and a trellis element to break up the roof deck.

Judd Black, Development Review Manager, confirmed that there are no standards for the top levels of garages, but in similar instances staff has asked for some treatment that would break up the vastness of the parking structure, such as landscape, trees or trellises.

Gary Harry, with KPG and on Metro design team, gave a brief history of the project. The goals of the project are to be a good neighbor to Edge Skate Park and to create a stronger pedestrian space than what is currently there. He clarified that the garage is not bi-level but a uniform level on top and the street trees are being replaced with six transit shelters for three stops along the 18-foot-wide sidewalk that increases another 8 feet at the curb balls on either end. They plan to preserve as many of the evergreen trees on the property as possible to screen this project from the retirement housing. He agreed that KPG Metro Team and Trammel Crow need to work together to make sure these two projects work better together.

Gary Prince, representing Metro Transit, passed out supplemental drawings and gave a quick review of the building presented at the previous pre-application since there were only two DRB members at that review, noting that the County elected to preserve buffers on the east and south sides of the building. He showed the present thinking on the garage and hoped they have captured most of the suggestions that were expressed at the first pre-application review. He explained that the green screen addresses preventing headlights from exiting the building. The only lighting on the upper deck is in the central deck, nothing out at the perimeter, and all the light fixtures have cutoff angles that preclude light from escaping. This project will be dwarfed by the adjacent TOD 6-story building 30 feet away. They hope to break up the adjacent façade with the level changes, the variation in openings, the green screen, and light screen. They have considered horizontal trellises for screening on the top level, but they would create a lighting challenge and possibly worse results than without them, so they would like to avoid them. He noted a concept landscape plan in the packet that shows the trees to be retained and the new plantings. He showed an example of the three-dimensional grid green screen material and explained that for security reasons they do not want these to be covered with plants.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Cope:

- Confirmed that there would be ground cover plantings on the south, and the existing ivy and some of the existing trees there would be removed.
- Requested to see the light screen that was solid metal and the green screen would be the color green but not covered with green vegetation.
- Confirmed that the cornice material would be the same metallic material as the canopies over the transit center. The cap on the brick walls would be metal coping.
- Confirmed that there would be provisions for bikes at the transit center next to the comfort station.
- Appreciated that on the north elevation the applicant addressed finding a home for all the newspaper boxes.
- Suggested wrapping the brick around the next bay and a half, then dying into the CMU rather than only wrapping around two bays.
- Appreciated the clarification between the two teams; would appreciate the two teams coordinating an accurate section between the two projects for the next review.
- Said that for making our city and neighborhoods more liveable, a free-standing parking garage is the most dreadful building that could be put in the city center. The greatest disturbance to him about this project is the lost opportunity. The residents who are only 30 feet away look down on that. Not an easy problem, but one that needs to be resolved creatively.
- Commented that transit nodes are an opportunity to activate a street because of the traffic they generate and that opportunity is absolutely missed here. When the garage faces onto an important urban street, this detracts from a liveable community. The first floor should have retail on it. He would vote no on this project as it is because instead of activating the street and a transit node it puts a dead zone there.
- Thought the elevation facing the mid-block connector is weak and not at all pedestrian friendly.
- Said he could not buy into this project because it is not the right thing at a very important place. The street level is desolate and dead—does not make sense.

Mr. Madrid:

- Commented that the garage in itself is probably fine, but there are so many elements lacking because the building next door is residential.
- Said that the upper part of the garage needs help. Cannot buy into those residents on that side of the building having to look down onto the top of a garage every day.
- Thought that the materials of the garage would look flat. The building next door has some very interesting articulation and materials. Treating the garage individually does not do justice to the overall project. Thought it worth treating the TOD as a landmark for that section of the city, taking elements from that landmark, and incorporating those into the garage for homogeneity.
- Agreed with Mr. Cope that the garage façade the way it is does not activate the street. The side of the garage bordering on the pedestrian path needs a lot of work, maybe some modulation of the elevations there, some landscape modulation notwithstanding the security issues. There is a great opportunity to do something with that spot.
- Encouraged King County Metro to work with Trammel Crow and try to bring this to a point where the City can be proud of the whole project.
- Thought that trellises would work just fine on the top of the garage.

Mr. Meade:

- Thought there was an opportunity for this building to tie with the TOD neighbor and the scale of that building in a way to unite this whole street as a district, or neighborhood, or allow this to look like a simple parking garage.
- Noted the opportunity to create retail on the first floor—coffee, shoe shine, skateboard, ice cream shops—little pocket things could happen there without impacting the security concept.
- Commented that the pedestrian path along the western edge and the north face are the two most important pieces on this project. If they could change grade in that walkway in such a way that by the midpoint the building is only 10 feet tall to the neighbor that would be a dramatically different perspective. So berming up against those buildings, taking some of the soil that will be excavated to make the TODs parking garage semi-underground, will be an opportunity to play down the scale and make the residents not feel that they are looking down over a giant parking garage.
- Commented regarding the concept of trellises—maybe those would not fit, but if a rooflike structure something like the language of the transit covers were mounted on the roof and something opaque added along the site lines, those could help to cut off the view of a good percentage, maybe 25%, of the parking.
- Suggested creating at the top story a five-foot-deep planter that would allow the planting of trees and shrubs that could come up and help activate the top of the structure, making a green edge.
- Suggested trying to create a small cityscape massing similar to the push and pull seen on the new neighbor.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Agreed with Mr. Cope that the use of the space at the street level at least in the north façade is important for a more interesting pedestrian experience.
- Suggested a bridge with a green area on the second floor connecting the TOD with the garage.
- Consider elements that create shade or contrast in the building.
- Liked the idea of creating something for the kids for connectivity from the skateboard park.
- Suggested mitigating the flat façade on the north façade by bumping out the building or adding on the second and maybe the third level, a gang of balconies, even if they are not real.

(Ms. Velastegui left the meeting at 11:00 p.m.)

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Did not want to go to the Hearing Examiner on another parking garage.
- Suggested that the design team go look at the parking garage across from the Lake Washington School District Building at Redmond Town Center, which has retail and shop windows along the street facade.

- Suggested adding restrooms on the first floor.
- Noted that the Marriott at Redmond Town Center is starting to put the trellises along the edge. There are at least 65 units that would look directly upon that garage—something has to be done to that flat surface of concrete.
- Noted that they are making gestures toward the historic reference by using brick, but not so sure the exact form of the building has to be so literal. Have to pick and choose the pattern language.
- Recommended that the garage and TOD buildings should communicate in forms and materials. This is such an opportunity when they are both going in at the same time.

ADJOURNMENT

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN AT 11:15 PM.
MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY